

CLAIM Amendments:

Cancel Claims 7-9 of record, and

substitute Claims (new) 10, 11, 12, 13,14,15,16: (below).

Listing of Claims Status

Claim 1-9 (Canceled)

Claim 10,11,12,13,14,15,16 (new).

Claim 10 (new): A back-up mirror system to improve safety when a driver begins driving a passenger vehicle in reverse into a lane of cross-traffic, comprising:

- (a) a passenger vehicle, including a driver's seat, a passenger compartment, a rear bumper fixed at the rear end, a second seating row's seatbacks fixed twelve or more inches forward of said rear end, a window at the rear of said passenger compartment, and
- (b) a rear-view mirror physically positioned with mounting means inside said passenger compartment in a location generally in front of said driver's seat row, said rear-view mirror's reflecting surface generally lying in a vertical plane and which reflecting surface faces generally toward the aft of said vehicle, and
- (c) a back-up mirror physically positioned with mounting means inside said passenger compartment at a location aft of or even with said vehicle's second seating row's seatbacks, said location also lying nine or more inches forward of said rear end, said back-up mirror's reflecting surface generally lying in a vertical plane, and which plane is also generally parallel with a side of said vehicle,

all of whose relative physical locations and reflecting relationships form a physical structure wherein an image of

a nearby oncoming cross-traffic object traveling in a lane of cross-traffic crossing behind said vehicle and still located 10 to 60 feet away from said vehicle's rear end

arrives at said driver's seat region via said rear-view mirror's image of said back-up mirror's image,

whereby a driver sees a view of said nearby oncoming cross-traffic object, which information is needed at the moment of deciding the safety of driving said vehicle in reverse into said lane of cross-traffic, whereby a collision can be better avoided.

Claim 11 (new): A back-up mirror system of Claim 10 whose back-up mirror is physically positioned with mounting means against a right-hand wall of said passenger compartment,

which system forms a physical structure wherein an image of oncoming cross-traffic traveling in a lane of traffic which crosses behind said vehicle, which oncoming cross-traffic is still 10 to 60 feet to the left of said vehicle's rear bumper, said image arrives at said driver's seat region via said rear-view mirror's image of said back-up mirror's image,

whereby a driver sees a view of said nearby oncoming cross-traffic object, which information is needed at the moment of deciding the safety of driving said vehicle in reverse into said lane of cross-traffic, whereby a collision can be better avoided.

Claim 12 (new): A back-up mirror system of Claim 10 whose back-up mirror is physically positioned with mounting means against a left-hand wall of said passenger compartment,

which system forms a physical structure wherein an image of oncoming cross-traffic traveling in a lane of traffic which crosses behind said vehicle, which oncoming cross-traffic is still 10 to 60 feet to the right of said

vehicle's rear bumper, said image arrives at said driver's seat region via said rear-view mirror's image of said back-up mirror's image,

whereby a driver sees a view of said nearby oncoming cross-traffic object, which information is needed at the moment of deciding the safety of driving said vehicle in reverse into said lane of cross-traffic, whereby a collision can be better avoided.

Claim 13(new) The back-up mirror system of Claim 10 wherein said back-up mirror mounting location is against a generally vertical surface on a left side or on a right side of said passenger compartment, which generally vertical surface also lies aft of an opening for a side-facing second row's window but lies nine or more inches forward of the vehicle's rear end.

Claim 14(new) The back-up mirror system of Claim 10 wherein said back-up mirror reflecting surface is slightly convex.

Claim 15(new) The back-up mirror system of Claim 10 wherein said back-up mirror reflecting surface is slightly curved.

Claim 16(new) The back-up mirror system of Claim 10 wherein said back-up mirror reflecting surface is flat.

(next page)

REMARKS

Remarks are in response to the two Office Action (O.A.)'s mailed 2003 Oct 14 and 2003 Mar 19, and describe the Applicant's amendments incorporated into the present substitute claims:

Claim 10 is a clarification, and substitution for the original Mirror System of Claim 1 (cancelled). Claim 10 expresses more narrowly the features and function of the present invention, and distinctly distinguishes its novel physical features over cited prior art references, as detailed below. These remarks also establish how the novel physical features of the present invention are unobvious and unanticipated. Claims 11,12,13,14,15,16 each recite the features of Claim 10, but with variations in embodiments:

Claim 11- the back-up mirror is further located by mounting it against the right-side wall of the passenger compartment (left-looking back-up mirror).

Claim 12- the back-up mirror of claim 10 is further located by mounting it against the left-side wall of the passenger compartment (right-looking back-up mirror).

Claim 13- describes an embodiment in a Chevy Suburban or similar large passenger vehicle (mini-Van or SUV, Sport Utility Vehicle) whose side windows of the passenger compartment continue all the way back (to the rear of the vehicle), that is, the passenger compartment reaches all the way back to the rear end, (unlike a 4-door passenger sedan which has a trunk & trunk deck interposed between the rear window of the passenger compartment and the vehicle's rear bumper), which means the side wall is actually a side window surface.

Claim 14- the back-up mirror reflecting surface is convex.

Claim 15- the back-up mirror reflecting surface is curved.

Claim 16- the back-up mirror reflecting surface is flat.

Claims Rejections under 35 USC §101 are overcome: The present claims no longer cite non-statutory subject matter, "a physical region", as a part of the physical structure. Instead, a "Nearby Oncoming Cross-traffic (23)" object present in the "Lane of cross-traffic crossing behind the driver's Vehicle(8)", is now cited very distinctly in the claims as: that definite oncoming object still 10-60 feet away which travels in the lane of cross-traffic passing behind the driver's vehicle, whose image is delivered to the driver by the mirror system, as illustrated in the Applicant's FIG. 1.

Claims Rejections under 35 USC §112, 2nd ¶, are overcome:

The claims are now clearer and more understandable, to overcome Rejections under 35 USC §112, because the phrase "physical region" is removed, and the metes and bounds are now made definite by expressing and distinctly pointing out the physical location of a "Nearby Oncoming Cross-Traffic (23)" object as a moving object which is "traveling in a lane of cross-traffic crossing behind said vehicle and still located 10 to 60 feet away from said vehicle's rear end".

Claim 7 Rejection under 35 USC §102(b) is overcome:

The Applicant pro se respectfully resubmits and reiterates that the present Back-up Mirror System has merit, and is physically distinguished over prior art by its novel physical features as recited in the present claims and as described below.

The Applicant will support these facts: Without being physically, geometrically altered, or geometrically re-aligned, to obey the specific unobvious physical relationship of elements taught by the unobvious structure of the present back-up mirror system, the cited prior art references are not capable of performing the function of the current invention; Prior art do not anticipate the present physical position for fixing the present back-up mirror, they instead teach away from it; Prior art do not recognize the

problem presently being solved; Prior art cited do not suggest modifications which would meet the physical elements of the present claims.

The structure of elements in the present invention is unobvious because, in spite of the now-obvious advantage lent to a backing-up driver, those skilled in this art have not yet implemented it. It solves a long-existing but unsolved need. Only with hindsight and making unobvious physical alterations of the prior art elements (mounting the back-up element generally aft of or even with the seatbacks AND nine or more inches forward of the rear-end), as seen in FIG 1, AND orienting the reflecting back-up surface in a generally vertical plane, AND alignments forming a geometry to permit viewing of an oncoming traffic object still 10- 60 feet away from the vehicle, could cited prior art begin to resemble the structure and function of the present back-up mirror system. Even very strained interpretation of Yue and Rubin, made with hindsight, cannot meet the current claims; Cited prior art solve different problems, not the present problem; the present claims recite the novel physical structure for the present problem being solved; The cited prior art literally teach away from the Applicant's novel physical structure of elements.

The Applicant reiterates that the geometric structure of the relatively placed combination of elements of the current back-up mirror invention is novel and has not been anticipated in prior art:

1. The prior art do not show the novel physical features of the present invention, including: teaching use of either a left-looking system or a right-looking system, (for viewing either direction of oncoming cross-traffic which will soon pass behind the vehicle); nor do they teach the use of a slightly convex or curved reflecting element for wider-angle viewing (instead, Jackson, Parking Device, 1937, specified concave, (and never cited convex); Yue, Adjustable Mirror Support, 1996, and Rubin, System for Viewing The Rear Seat, 1996, do not mention or suggest convex or curved, either. Prior art do

not include, or suggest, any back-up element reflecting surface which is held in a generally vertical plane, while simultaneously facing a side of the vehicle (the mirror is generally parallel to the side of the car) while positioned aft-of or even-with the second-row's seatbacks, and nine or more inches forward of the vehicle rear end. The prior art are complete and functional in themselves for solving their respective problems and they teach away from a structure presently claimed (their teachings are contrary to the structure presently claimed), they do not suggest modifications which meet the currently claimed structure of elements.

2. The novel physical structure of elements in the current back-up mirror system produces beneficial, and unexpected new results and solves a long-felt, unsolved need to reduce accidents, property damage, and injuries resulting from collisions when backing up into a lane of cross-traffic; since no prior art has been shown to rely on this novel structure, nor solve the present safety problem, it is hence unobvious and therefore patentable over the references. Just because the present back-up mirror system relies on two mirrors mounted inside a vehicle compartment does not mean that prior art making use of a second interior-mounted mirror have anticipated the present physical structure nor solved the present problem.

Jackson literally stated that positioning its rear mirror inside the closed automobile will maintain the beauty of the exterior of the automobile (line33), but the Applicant asserts that Jackson's claimed structure could never anticipate positioning its back-up mirror element "slightly aft of or even with the second row's seatbacks and nine or more inches forward of the rear end", because the result of such a suggestion would be inoperative: viewing the neighbor's rear bumper (one to two feet away) could not be achieved because the view would be blocked by the opaque car body; the device of Jackson illustrates (J.Figs 1 and 3) and teaches its parking mirror as mounted even with the rear end of the vehicle for this very reason, therefore

the device of Jackson could not function from inside the compartment without also having a rear-end mounting position for the Jackson mirror system to result in the claimed resulting image. Hence, the mirror system of Jackson cannot possibly anticipate a mirror mounting position which lies "nine or more inches forward of" its rear- window(12), (which is itself fixed at the vehicle rear-end) (Jackson FIGs 1 and 3). This is especially true because Jackson's neighboring rear-bumper (or curb) of interest lies in a horizontal plane significantly below the horizontal plane passing through Jackson's flat parking mirror element mounting location (Jackson Fig. 3), hence, it is Incorrect to construe that Jackson's mirror(14) faces generally horizontally, i.e., it actually faces at a significantly-downward angle towards the driver's own rear bumper; this is further proven by Jackson's own FIG. 1 which illustrates a light ray emanating upward from the closeby pavement, curb, or neighbor's bumper (an area situated well below the mounting site of Jackson-mirror 14), the ray is emanating in a steeply upwards direction, which proves that Jackson's rear mirror element is not aimed in a generally horizontal plane, that is, its reflecting surface does not lie in a generally vertical plane at all. The present invention relies on a different geometry of mirror-aiming, and different mirror positioning (mounting location) to solve a different problem, which problem is not suggested by Jackson.

That locating the back-up mirror on the side of the passenger compartment (the side pillar) would have been obvious for unobstructing the view out the rear window, is Incorrect, for such a mounting location in Jackson's system is guaranteed to result in an inoperable Jackson device: the opaque body work would block the rays emanating upward from the closeby neighboring bumper (or curb) of interest.

Again, the structure of Jackson claims and teaches "a reflecting means fixed at the rear-end of the vehicle", so, again, the suggestion is Incorrect that "if Jackson's second mirror is positioned inside the closed automobile, it

could be slightly aft of or even with the second row seatbacks", for that would result in an inoperable embodiment of Jackson's claimed device, due to the opaque bodywork blocking the rays emanating from the neighboring rear-bumper. Furthermore, the present claims are now worded to distinctly teach a mounting position fixed significantly forward of the vehicle's rear-end, so Claims language now distinguishes the present novel positioning at "nine or more inches forward of the vehicle rear-end". Jackson specifically, literally, teaches and claims a right-looking mirror alignment to view a second vehicle's rear bumper located just "one to two feet to the right of said first vehicle"; Jackson does not offer any suggestion or modifications to meet the present claims which structure requires novel, unexpected alignments and mounting locations to produce a view of another object (to the left or to the right) distinguished in the present Claims as "a nearby oncoming cross-traffic object traveling in a lane of cross-traffic crossing behind said vehicle and still 10 to 60 feet away from said vehicle's rear end". Jackson's mirror system does not offer the advantage of the present invention: to provide a driver a view of any nearby oncoming cross-traffic still 10-60 feet away, left-looking or right-looking, which information is needed at the moment of deciding the safety of driving the vehicle in reverse into a lane of cross-traffic, to better avoid a collision with moving objects or injuries. Jackson does not suggest a device to avoid collisions with moving objects or avoid injuries, and it will be Incorrect to suggest that the device of Jackson enables a driver to perform the presently claimed function of "viewing a nearby oncoming cross-traffic object traveling in a lane of cross-traffic crossing behind said vehicle and still 10 to 60 feet away from said vehicle's rear end". Also, being a very, very old reference, 1937, and therefore a weak reference, Jackson should be construed very narrowly.

The geometry and reflecting relationships of the structure and claim of Jackson do not produce nor anticipate or teach the structure claimed in the

present invention. Jackson's claimed mirror arrangement (Parking Device) does not physically enable a driver to see moving objects still 10 to 60 feet away from the passenger vehicle which are in a lane of oncoming transverse cross-traffic. The present (clarified, reworded) claims make all these distinctions. Claims 10,11,12,13,14,15,16 contain distinctions of patentable merit because of the new result: a driver sees an alternative view of a oncoming cross-traffic object nearby (still 10-60 feet away) in a lane of cross-traffic about to pass behind one's vehicle, which information is needed at the moment of deciding the safety of driving one's vehicle in reverse into that lane of cross-traffic, to better avoid a collision or injuries, using its back-up mirror element mounted at a novel position, defined as being "at a location aft of or even with said vehicle's second seating row's seatbacks, said location lying nine or more inches forward of said rear end, said back-up mirror's reflecting surface generally lying in a vertical plane, and which plane is generally parallel to a side of said vehicle", whose relative position and novel alignment to the other elements produces a novel structure of elements which is not anticipated, suggested, or taught by Jackson.

Claims rejections under 35 USC §103(a), unpatentable over Jackson, are overcome:

Regarding the method of Claim 8(cancelled), The back-up mirror Method, Claim 8 has been cancelled without substitution.

Regarding Claim 9(cancelled, but Claim 10 as substitution): as recently discussed above, the Applicant reiterates: locating the present back-up mirror on a side surface of the passenger compartment, such as onto a side pillar, was absolutely never an obvious (nor operable) choice at the time of Jackson's invention, for it would have resulted in a completely non-functional, inoperable embodiment of Jackson's claim, due to the opaqueness of the car-body materials which would have blocked all light rays emanating upwards from Jackson's neighboring rear-bumper/curb from reaching the element. Therefore,

the present mounting position onto a side pillar (nearly vertical side-surface, i.e. wall) of a passenger compartment, at nine or more inches forward of the rear-end, is not an obvious position for any embodiment of Jackson's device. The Applicant declares that a mounting position of a back-up mirror being chosen and specified to not obstruct a view out the rear window is not only a favorable design benefit, but since such a modification was not suggested or taught by Jackson, it was therefore not obvious at the time of Jackson's invention, or it would have been taught by Jackson. That the Jackson parking mirror¹⁴ is oriented generally horizontally is Incorrect, the reference was misunderstood, because the Jackson mirror¹⁴ is actually aimed, tilted, or angled somewhat downward, not lying in a generally vertical plane at all. Jackson's mirror arrangement does not enable the driver to perform the present function, i.e. to see an oncoming cross-traffic object which lies 10-60 feet from the rear-end of the vehicle, nor does Jackson suggest modifications which would achieve this function. Also, being a very, very old reference, 1937, and therefore a weak reference, Jackson should be construed very narrowly; any suggestions of physical modifications to the structure of Jackson to solve the present problem have been made in hindsight.

Rejection of Claims 7, 9 under 35 USC §103(a) as unpatentable over Yue is now overcome:

The device of Yue, an Adjustable Mirror Support, is merely a multi-stage, multi-state adjustable support-linkage-device with its stated function being to allow either a mirror or a photograph to be fastened onto a rear-door's side-window by suction cup, with its stated need being solved: 'to provide a vanity mirror for use by passengers seated in the second row'. While the Yue mirror⁵ is indeed generally illustrated in Yue FIG.4 as being aimed generally horizontally and generally facing a side of the vehicle, Yue specifically teaches that the function of the device is to be moveable(aimable) to aim towards the rear-passenger's own face and eyes, and the Applicant submits that

the Yue FIG.4 was arbitrarily drawn in its shown orientation merely to enable a clearer illustration of the Yue mechanism, not actually illustrating the disposition of the linkage during use by a second-row passenger; hence, that the reference teaches or anticipates a horizontally-aimed mirror is Incorrect, and misconstrues the reference, for such aiming would not achieve Yue's stated function. Next, there is no convincing argument that Yue suggests or teaches a driver should view any part of the device of Yue, and Yue teaches away from such a function, namely, by teaching that the rear passenger use the device; any suggestion that Yue's device enables the driver to view objects outside the vehicle is made in hindsight, and misconstrues the reference and is Incorrect.

The device claimed and illustrated by Yue could never anticipate being positioned/mounted aft of or even with the second row seatbacks, for then the second row passengers would not be able to carry out the stated function/advantage, 'to view the item mounted on the Yue linkage', without having to turn to face behind them; therefore, it is Incorrect to suppose that the device taught by Yue could "obviously" be mounted on a location on the "side pillar separating the side window from the rear windshield", aft of or even with the second row's seatbacks. The linkage-support-device claimed and taught by Yue in Yue's FIG.4 intentionally obstructs the views of the second-row passenger through their door's side window, for it is intentionally being suctioned onto the smooth glass of the side-door; the suction cup would not suction well onto fabric upholstery commonly found on side-pillar surfaces aft of the second seating row, nor suction well onto a formed metal pillar having a curved surface (no sharp corners inside the compartment for safety reasons). The device of Yue in Yue FIG.4 is not a mirror system at all, for it does not suggest, teach, or mention any modification incorporating any second mirror, nor does Yue teach, suggest, or mention any geometric relationship between the device and the (inherent) rear-view mirror, nor teach, suggest, rely on or

mention any relationship between the device and objects outside the vehicle, nor teach, suggest, rely on, or mention any spatial relationship between the device and the driver, nor suggest or recognize the present problem. Instead, Yue teaches that the object fastened to the linkage-device be 'aimed' toward the face and eyes of a second row passenger, for direct self-viewing, with no mention or suggestion of an interposed second reflecting element. Yue does not teach or suggest a driver to make use of the Yue device. Any suggestion that the suction-cup device of Yue enables a driver to see objects outside the vehicle is misconstruing the reference (the reference was misunderstood), especially since the device of Yue is an invention in a different field, namely, "mirror moveable relative to support". The device taught by Yue does not teach, suggest, or rely on any rear-view reflecting element forward of the driver's row, as does the present invention. Suggestions made regarding the device of Yue to perform the present function can only be made in hindsight AND with all the added features of the present invention including: a.) the present novel, unobvious back-up mounting location, b.) the present novel, unobvious geometry between elements' positions (driver's seat, rear-view mirror, second-row-seatbacks, back-up mirror, oncoming cross-traffic objects), c.) the participation of the driver. For these reasons, the present invention therefore distinguishes over Yue's adjustable, suction-cup support-arm-device and distinguishes over the embodiment shown in Yue FIG. 4 by, again,: a.) teaching a novel, unanticipated, unobvious, and unexpected mounting location in the compartment for its back-up mirror element, b.) reciting a structure requiring two mirror elements, and c.) the novel required reflecting relationships between them for viewing cross-traffic objects, and d.) the unobvious geometry of the structure which relies on the driver's seat, the rear-view mirror, the second row's seatbacks, the back-up mirror, and a nearby oncoming cross-traffic object in a lane of cross traffic, (which structure solves a problem unrecognized by Yue), which structure is e.) providing the

result of an alternative view of nearby oncoming cross-traffic for the driver, and is f.) teaching the novel, unobvious aiming of the back-up mirror surface to be in a plane nearly parallel with a side of the car and simultaneously held in a generally vertical plane, g.) teaching a driver to use a 2-mirror system to obtain a view of a nearby oncoming cross-traffic object.

The present claims clearly, distinctly, express these enumerated distinguishing differences and advantages.

Rejection of Claim 7-9 under 35 USC §103(a) over Rubin is overcome:

The Optical System of Rubin teaches a mirror pivotally attached to the roof structure inside the compartment at a position above the second seating row seat-cushions, illustrated in Rubin FIGs 7,8, and 9. Rubin distinctly teaches a second-row passenger to swivel it into an alternate position in order to provide the self-stated function of acting as an opaque sunshade (sun-visor) to partially block a second row's side-window, (blocking the incoming light from falling onto the face of a second row passenger (FIG.9, mirror122)), or, the self-stated subsequent function of 'swivelling to face the mirror surface towards the rear of the vehicle (FIG8) for the second row passenger's own self-viewing'.

When the Rubin roof-mount mirror is swiveled to lie in a plane generally parallel with the side of the vehicle, it is literally taught to be utilized as a sun-visor by and for a second row passenger; Rubin does not suggest or teach modifications for its mirror122 embodiment to be used in conjunction with any other mirror, rearward facing mirror or otherwise, at all, whatsoever. Any interpretation of Rubin suggesting it includes a possible stud102 location directly above the second row seatbacks, (resulting in mirror122 positioned aft of seatbacks), is very strained, and misunderstands the reference, because the stated purpose of stud102's location is to provide a swivel to permit the intentional blocking of light rays streaming into the side window101 by mirror122, i.e., intentionally obstructing the side window.

Suggesting a sun-visor aft of a second row passenger on the side pillar misunderstands the reference, for it could not perform its stated function of blocking light coming in through the side window onto the second row passenger's face, hence, the suggestion is Incorrect that locating mirror122 on the side pillar aft of the rear seatbacks would have been obvious for Rubin's device; the suggestion misconstrues the reference which intentionally desires the side window to be obstructed. Rubin's mirror System for Viewing the Rear Seat does not recognize the present problem, nor solve the present problem, nor does Rubin's 122sun-visor solve or recognize the present problem. Rubin's 122sun-visor mirror position does not suggest or specify any function other than that of a visor. Any interpretation of a Rubin122sun-visor as a method for viewing objects outside the vehicle is a strained interpretation, made in hindsight, and misunderstands the reference because Rubin never suggests a driver view any objects outside the vehicle, and never teaches a reflecting element be positioned aft of the second row's seatbacks. It is Incorrect to construe that Rubin's mirror122 (visor) enables a driver to see objects outside the vehicle, much less see them by way of the rearview mirror; any such suggestion can only be made in hindsight AND with all the added features of: a.)the present mounting position of back-up mirror, b.)the present geometry between elements (driver's seat, rear-view mirror, seatbacks, back-up mirror, oncoming cross-traffic object) c.)a structure whose reflecting alignment is providing the result of an alternative view of a nearby oncoming cross-traffic object for the driver, and is d.) teaching the aiming of the back-up mirror surface to be in a plane generally parallel with the side of the car and simultaneously held in a generally vertical plane while used actively as a reflecting element (not just an opaque sunshade), e.) teaching a driver to use a 2-mirror system to obtain a view of a moving object 10-60 feet outside the vehicle.

The device of Rubin is in a different technical field, namely, 'retractible vehicle mirror'. The present invention is a mirror-based safety system for vehicles. The present claims are submitted to be of patentable merit because the present invention provides previously unsuggested collision avoidance by means of its novel 2-mirror structure and unobvious geometry as recited in the claims.

Again, the present invention differs by relying on a structure whose geometry is dependent upon the back-up mirror's mounting location relative to the second row of seating and relative to the rear-view mirror, driver's seat, and relies on the reflecting relationships relative to the that part of the cross-traffic lane containing a nearby oncoming cross-traffic object still lying 10 to 60 feet away from the vehicle's rear end, resulting in a novel alignment and physical structure of elements, with embodiments with either flat, curved, or convex back-up mirror surface.

The present back-up mirror invention solves a growing need for greater safety when backing-up into a lane or lanes of cross-traffic (see back-up collision statistics quoted in the Specification). Prior art do not teach a mirror system which solves this need, nor mention or identify the present need. The present novel structure has an alignment and positioning of elements which has not been shown to be relied upon (nor adequately shown to be anticipated/suggested) by prior art references; nor has the present problem been suggested/anticipated by the cited prior art.

The present invention offers an improvement by making a particular safety advance for backing-up drivers, which in prior art safety-measures has not been addressed or solved, therefore it was not an obvious solution. The specific problem being solved in the present invention has not been recognized by prior art safety measures, as far as the Applicant knows. Prior art lack any suggestion that they be modified in a manner to meet the present claims, and furthermore, they lack any suggestion that they be modified to produce the

current results. The Jackson reference is very, very old, and therefore should be construed narrowly; the devices of Jackson, Yue, or Rubin do not recognize the present problem being solved. If the present invention were in fact obvious, it would have been implemented by now by those skilled in the art. Despite its relatively low cost and great safety advantage, it's not having being implemented by now indicates its unobviousness, especially with the long-felt, unsolved need to solve this growing problem (more mini-vans and SUV's in parking lots during the 1990's). The references of Yue and Rubin were misunderstood because neither one teaches or suggests a mirror system to improve the safety of a backing-up driver; neither one teaches or suggests the use of a mirror system to aid a driver in viewing objects outside the vehicle, therefore, the OA's interpretations of Yue and Rubin are strained, the suggestion of a mirror arrangement of Rubin for use by the driver to see objects outside the vehicle is an interpretation made only in hindsight. The present invention solves a different problem than Yue or Rubin, which present problem is: to improve the safety of a backing-up driver from being hit by an oncoming cross-traffic object. The present invention provides an advantage which has not been appreciated before, by solving the present problem.

In spite of the seeming simplicity or seeming obviousness of the present invention, it appears to be unsuggested in prior art, and unobvious to car-safety design-engineers who have not been shown to have ever manufactured the present structure of inexpensive elements into their vehicles, yet complicated electronic systems to sense or video objects immediately behind luxury passenger vehicles have been for sale on new vehicles in the last 3 or more years, which expensive systems partly addressed the serious safety-problems of backing-up, but these commercially available systems have failed to recognize or solve the present, different, unrecognized, unaddressed problem: to view an oncoming cross-traffic object arriving from the left (or right) of the

driver's backing-up vehicle, but still 10-60 feet away in the lane of cross-traffic.

Request for Claim Drafting Assistance

In view of prior earnest attempts at drafting allowable claims, prior Amendments' remarks, and prior Responses to O.A.s', and the present Amendment's Claims and Remarks, the Applicant pro se solicits reconsideration of merit, and resubmits that patentable subject matter is clearly present.

If the examiner agrees that the claims are technically inadequate, the Applicant respectfully, sincerely, requests that the examiner write an acceptable claim(s) pursuant to MPEP 707.07(j) on behalf of the Applicant.

The Applicant submits that the physical structure of the present system of mirrors, including its back-up mirror mounting location "slightly aft of or even with the second row's seatbacks and nine or more inches forward of the rear end" is unobvious, and not anticipated, and is unexpected. (See Applicant's FIG.1, location of back-up mirror (6)). The present mirror system relies on a back-up mirror's physical mounting position which is not taught, suggested, or anticipated by the cited prior art; it also relies on its back-up mirror's reflecting-surface to physically lie in a nearly vertical plane, (i.e. aimed substantially horizontally) which simultaneously lies in a plane nearly parallel with a side of the vehicle. It also relies on a two-mirror system. These physical distinctions are submitted to be of patentable merit under Section 103.

The Applicant submits, as previously, that the step forward represented by the present invention should be regarded as useful to society, and represents a significant step and advancement, since it is an improvement to help reduce the frequency of property damage and help reduce the frequency of bodily injuries caused by collisions between an oncoming cross-traffic object and a backing-up vehicle, whose driver's view was otherwise blocked.

Conclusion:

The Applicant pro se has herein requested amendments to the Claims of this Application. The Applicant has explained in the Remarks how prior Rejections are now overcome. The Application recites a novel structure of elements that is physically different from prior art, which unobvious structure produces new results, which new results meet an unsolved, long-felt need for a simple and inexpensive system to improve driver safety when backing-up their passenger vehicle into lane(s) of cross-traffic, by providing an alternative view to the driver; the physical distinctions of the present novel structure are of patentable merit under Section 103. The Applicant wishes to place this application in full condition for allowance as soon as possible.

Very Respectfully,

William L. Morrison

William L. Morrison, Applicant Pro Se

-----**Certificate of Mailing:**

I certify that on the date below, this document will be deposited with the US Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope, postage prepaid, addressed to:

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

On 2003 November 10,

William L. Morrison
William L. Morrison, Applicant pro se
1023 W. Crescent Ave., Park Ridge, IL 60068
(847) 825-6871